

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 977(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 977(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 977.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT**

M. S., SR.,

Petitioner,

v.

THE SUPERIOR COURT OF STANISLAUS
COUNTY,

Respondent;

STANISLAUS COUNTY COMMUNITY
SERVICES AGENCY,

Real Party in Interest.

F041801

(Super. Ct. Nos. JUV 504137,
JUV 504140)

OPINION

THE COURT*

ORIGINAL PROCEEDINGS; petition for extraordinary writ review. Nancy
Barnett Williamsen, Commissioner.

Stephen L. Foley, for Petitioner.

No appearance for Respondent.

Michael H. Krausnick, County Counsel and Linda S. Macy, Deputy County
Counsel, for Real Party in Interest.

-ooOoo-

*Before Harris, A.P.J., Levy, J., and Gomes, J.

Petitioner M. S., Sr., seeks extraordinary writ review (Welf. & Inst. Code,¹ §366.26, subd. (I); Cal. Rules of Court, rule 39.1B) of respondent court's order that a section 366.26 hearing be held on February 13, 2003, as to his son, M.S., Jr., and stepson, R.B. He contends the court erred in terminating reunification services. We conclude he waived his right to appellate review by failing to appeal from the court's order terminating reunification services. Accordingly, we will deny the petition.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS

On April 30, 2001, the Stanislaus County Community Services Agency took petitioner's three stepchildren, R.B., J.B. and M.B., and his son, M.S., Jr., into protective custody and thereafter filed a petition alleging the parents failed to protect the children and provide them support. (§ 300, subds. (b), (g).) The juvenile court sustained the allegations and ordered reunification services for both parents. At the 12-month review hearing on May 28, 2002, the juvenile court terminated reunification services for petitioner and ordered continued services for the children's mother. Petitioner did not appeal from the court's order. On October 28, 2002, at the conclusion of the 18-month review hearing, the court terminated the mother's reunification services and set the matter for permanency planning. On October 30, 2002, petitioner filed a notice of intent to file a writ petition in the matter of R.B. and M.S., Jr.

DISCUSSION

All orders subsequent to the dispositional order in dependency proceedings are directly appealable. (*In re Meranda P.* (1997) 56 Cal.App.4th 1143, 1150.) Unappealed postdisposition orders are final and binding. (*Ibid.*) Therefore, petitioner waived his right to appellate review of the juvenile court's order terminating reunification services by failing to appeal from the termination order. Notwithstanding waiver, petitioner's

¹ All statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code unless otherwise indicated.

claim is cognizable only as to son, M.S., Jr. As R.B.'s stepfather, petitioner does not have standing to seek review by this court of findings and orders pertaining to reunification services provided to R.B.'s parents. (*In re Clifford S.* (1995) 38 Cal.App.4th 747, 752.)

DISPOSITION

The petition for extraordinary writ is denied. This petition is final forthwith as to this court.